

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Final Office Action dated November 16, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1–3, 5–6, and 8 are hereby amended. Claims 1–12 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1–7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,580,473 to Kim (hereinafter “Kim”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,886,757 to Song et al. (hereinafter “Song”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,760,854 to Ono et al. (hereinafter “Ono”); and rejects claims 8–12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Song and further in view of Ono.

In response to previous arguments, the Examiner asserts that “[b]ecause the Applicant ha[d] not addressed the substantive rejections with regard to the dependent claims, Applicant is presumed to have acquiesced to the rejections of record regarding the dependent claims.” Applicant respectfully submits that all of the rejections, including those of the dependent claims, were addressed in the previous arguments. For example, the Applicant amended each of the independent claims, distinguished those claims from the two references, and then submitted that the independent claims, including the dependent claims that respectively depend from the independent claims, were allowable over the cited references. The Examiner did not apply any additional references to any of the dependent claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully does not acquiesce to any of the rejections of record regarding any of the dependent claims.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1–7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Song and further in view of Ono. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests reconsideration because Kim, Song, and Ono, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest every element of independent claims 1 and 3. For example, amended claim 1 recites “the pixel electrode directly contacts the insulating substrate, the drain electrode, and a gate insulating film contacting a gate electrode,” and amended claim 3 recites “the pixel electrode directly contacts the substrate, the drain electrode, and a gate insulating film

contacting the gate electrode.” Nothing in Kim, Song, or Ono, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 3, and claims 2 and 4–7, which respectively depend from claims 1 and 3, are allowable over the cited references.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 8–12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Song and further in view of Ono. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests reconsideration for the same or similar reasons as those above. For example, independent claim 8, as amended, recites “the pixel electrode directly contacts the substrate, the drain electrode, and a gate insulating film contacting the gate electrode.” Nothing in Kim, Song, or Ono, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 8, and claims 9–12, which depend from claim 8, are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

Application No.: 10/028,984
Amdt. dated April 18, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action dated November 16, 2004

Docket No.: 8733.563.00

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: April 18, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes ^{Reg. No.} 53,005
for Rebecca Goldman Rudich
Registration No.: 41,786
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant

DC:50310403.1